

NOTES FOR  
CAREER COUNCIL MEETING

21 June 1956

\*\*\*\*\*

DOCUMENT NO. \_\_\_\_\_  
NO CHANGE IN CLASS. ☐  
☒ DECLASSIFIED  
CLASS. CHANGED TO: TS 8 C  
NEXT REVIEW DATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
AUTH: HR 702  
DATE: 5/26/81 REVIEWER: 016905

PROPOSED COMPETITIVE PROMOTION SYSTEM

I met yesterday with the Support Career Board, which is composed of the Heads of the Career Services in the OD/S area, to discuss the "Proposed Competitive Promotion System" as it was presented to the Council. Generally speaking, the Heads of the Career Services in our area recognized the need for a Competitive Promotion System and believed the proposed program to be workable. I would like to summarize for you, however, the pertinent points raised for consideration at this meeting. I will divide them into two categories. I believe that there are fairly simple solutions to the points raised in the first category, but that in the second there are more fundamental questions which should be considered by the Council.

CATEGORY I:

1. Will not this system penalize a man who is particularly well suited for a specific job and, therefore, should be given priority over others with whom he is in competition?

Answer: The proposed system recognizes this possibility and does not prohibit spot promotions.

2. Will this system not have a tendency to relieve immediate supervisors of their responsibilities for recommending promotions?

Answer: Supervisors would in no way be relieved of their responsibilities.

3. Is it desirable to create an additional group of panels in addition to the Career Service Boards already in existence?

Answer: Under the proposed system a Career Board or an existing panel could do the work which is outlined for the various panels.

4. Won't the preparation of profiles be a considerable workload?

Answer: Yes, but I think that we are coming to this regardless of the promotion system which we use in order to afford greater "privacy of the file."

5. Would Career Services be able to sub-allot their promotion quotas in order to provide competition between functional specialists such as psychologists, rather than to have a psychologist competing against an administrative officer, which, of course, would be difficult to judge?

Answer: We believe that the system is designed to permit sub-allocation.

#### CATEGORY II:

1. Is mandatory review each six months manageable? Will the sheer volume of work for a panel result in superficial consideration? In order to cut down the workload, should we confine competitive promotion to the higher grades for the time being?

2. Is it desirable to have mass promotions in a given grade, or would it be better to have a system which distributed these promotions over the entire six months period?

3. Should we have a quota system, or should Career Services be able to promote within the limits of authorized tables of organization?

4. Since promotion is only one facet of personnel administration, are we not placing too much emphasis on the words "promotion" and "zone of consideration?" Should we not think of this examination as a "performance review" which would consider who to get rid of, who should have additional training, etc., and who to promote?